1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

consequences. It instructed that the names of semi-nomad shepherds should be added to the citizenship roll of either the summer or the winter village of their grazing grounds. A majority of the Sarakatsani with grazing in the western and central Zagori elected to write their names on the roll of their summer village.[14] The purpose of the central government was to control an untidy and potentially disorderly element in a state based on the village community of settled peasantry. However, the proud villagers of Zagori with their inherited pretensions were deeply dismayed at this act of arbitrary legislation. While their own youth left for the town and city, rights of citizenship in the villages were by law extended to uncivilized and uneducated shepherds. Traditionally the Sarakatsani had built their summer huts on the grazing land they leased. But now possessing the rights of village citizenship, some bought houses in the depopulated village and others began to build their groups of huts on its outskirts. Daily contact between the two communities in these circumstances intensified their traditional antipathy. Yet at the same time the newly acquired local voting rights necessarily integrated the Sarakatsani into the village patronage system, and the villagers' attitude of open contempt forced them slowly but certainly to a growing conformity with village habits at least in their more outward and material aspects.

There were also important changes in the forms of co-operation between families within the community. Previously the grazing of areas carrying two or three thousand sheep had been sold each year by Zagori villages to the leading families of Sarakatsani. For these alone had the wealth and experience to carry through the negotiation. Through the lease of this grazing, the head of such a family, the tselingas (τσέλιγγας), also controlled a number of other families who contracted to work with him for the summer or winter period. The nucleus of the group was co-operating families (σμίχτες) often related by kinship or marriage; but a number of unrelated men with few or no animals of their own were also associated as wage shepherds.

[14] However, a village could resist the application if it was able to show that grazing land was not available. Since the pressure on grazing land was greater in the plains, Sarakatsani often had no other choice but to apply for citizenship in a mountain village.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

In its physical aspect as a complex of flocks, grazing lands, huts, and sheep-folds it was referred to as a stani (στάνη), or when the speaker was more concerned with the relations of dependence and co-operation between the tselingas and his followers, as the 'tselingato' (τὸ τσελιγκᾶτο); 50–150 men, women and children were the approximate human limits of the traditional stani. Although the co-operating families paid at the end of each period of six months for a share of the grazing land in proportion to the size of their flocks, the power of the tselingas was great. Since the lease was his own, a family unwilling to accept his authority could be expelled. The sale of milk, meat, and wool, the purchase of flour, salt, and other essential needs of the stani, were entirely in his hands. Through the six-month period the other families lived on his credit, and at its close his detailed calculations of profit and debt were necessarily taken on trust since he was often the only literate man in the group.

The measures of 1930 concerning protected leases had already modified the power of the tselingas since not only he but all his associated shepherds were individually protected under the law. But the regulations of Metaxas radically reinforced this trend since now each shepherd citizen was firmly entitled to graze his sheep for six months on the communal grassland of his own village. Thus in the summer pastures of the Zagori villages where a majority of the community had claimed their rights of citizenship, the size of the stani became more narrowly related to the simple needs of sheep management. In general, it became smaller in numbers, seldom exceeding 30 men, women, and children, but sometimes including only the members of a single family; its members were now almost exclusively kinsmen and affinal relations; its structure was looser and more egalitarian. There were parallel changes in the size and form of the winter stani. The winter groups, however, remained somewhat larger (up to 50 persons of all ages and sometimes more), since with lambing and milking more hands are needed in winter than summer. Moreover, with the shortage of winter grazing any man with land at his disposal, which for one reason or another was not subject to a protected lease, was still able to hold in a position of dependence as many sheep and men as his land would carry.

A further consequence was that the poorer shepherds.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

S
178
474
233
556

relieved from the various pressures that the tselingas had previously been able to apply, and now entitled to secure grazing rights, were able gradually to increase their flocks or, if they were wage shepherds, to build up a small flock that had not previously existed. At the same time the impossibility of finding considerable tracts of winter grazing forced the rich tselingas to reduce the size of his flocks below the formerly modest limit of a thousand. The conjunction of these trends has led to a more even distribution of wealth in the community.

S
G
198
162
619
621
563

I have indicated some of the geographical and historical conditions that help to explain the presence of the Sarakatsani in Zagori. And I have referred to more recent developments that have introduced important changes in the internal structure of the community and in its relation to the outside world. But these general considerations also emphasize the inherent vulnerability of a transhumant shepherd community in a society of settled villages. Historically, and still today, the village is the important political and social unit in rural Greece. Its elected officials are used by the Greek Government in many matters (as they were by the Ottomans) as the final link in the bureaucratic hierarchy. They are a channel of government and a channel of patronage. Yet many of the Sarakatsani of Zagori still have no secure political rights in the plains where their difficulties are greatest. There, many stand outside the political body of the village, membership of which would grant them each year the right on which their survival as a community depends, the right to graze.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

But these visits are unlikely to be merely social and the main purpose of the journey is generally the arrangement of some business. At festivals, on the other hand, kinsmen meet to enjoy one another's company and other considerations are secondary. On the Tuesday after Easter Monday a man often sets off on a journey to a close kinsman living at a distance whom he has not seen during the winter. And after the feast of St. George before the migration to summer pastures there may be a wedding to attend. Later in the year when the Sarakatsani have moved up to the mountain villages of the Zagori there are other opportunities to meet less closely related kinsmen. About the end of July when the impregnated ewes gradually cease to yield milk, there is more leisure for the shepherds to attend the weddings, most of which occur in August and September. Also a number of the villages in the Zagori celebrate in the summer the feast-day of their patron saint. These village feasts (πανηγύρια) last for three days and nights during which there is almost continuous dancing in the village square with much eating and drinking besides. Many Sarakatsani go to these village festivals not only when it is the feast-day of the saint of their own summer village, but also to the celebrations of other villages where they have a kinsman. In the holiday atmosphere they are hospitably welcomed and their company and conversation give pleasure to their hosts. It makes no difference whether visitors are near or distant relatives; the more visitors a family entertains the more its prestige increases. But in addition to these public festivals each Sarakatsan family, or stani, celebrates privately one of the three summer religious festivals which they consider important. These are: the prophet Elias, 20th July, Saint Paraskeve, 26th July, and the Assumption of the All Holy One (The Virgin Mary), 15th August. On these feast-days meat is killed, wine is drunk, and in the larger stanis there is dancing. It is essentially a family celebration but kinsmen, who live in other villages and celebrate a different festival, will come to visit and share in the festivities. These are the various occasions which help to maintain a certain minimal frequency of contact between dispersed kinsmen, although the demands of the sheep prevent any individual shepherd from being present at more than one or perhaps two of these events each year.

But weddings are, undoubtedly, the most significant of these

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 578 685 There existed also a more ambitious form of sheep theft, which was less often attempted, partly because of the considerable danger and partly because it made even greater demands on the time and energy of the thieves than the variety already described. Three or four kinsmen, travelling swiftly from their homes, arrived at the victims' grazing land about dusk. As soon as it grew dark, they cut out fifty or so sheep and, using a carefully prospected route, drove the animals through the hours of darkness to a secluded river bed or forest clearing, which was distant both from the thieves' own home and the home of the [439] victim. From this place of relative security, the animals were delivered in batches to some Jannina livestock merchant for slaughter; the latter would ask no questions, but also paid a [422] price less than the market rate. Sometimes the ear-signs on the animals were carefully altered and the animals were added, some to the flocks of the thieves, and others to those of kinsmen who lived at a distance from the victim. Care was taken to arrange a wide distribution of the animals so that the chances of recognition were less than if the animals remained together in a single body. For reasons analogous to those already given for the avoidance of small-scale sheep theft on the flocks of immediate neighbours, these more ambitious operations were carried out at even greater distance from the homes of the raiders, generally at the farthest limit of the community some 15–20 miles distant, or on the flocks of Koutsovlachs beyond the community boundary. Fear of massive retaliation also prevented men from boasting about this kind of exploit, at least until some years after the event. Secrecy was essential. Nevertheless, the [550] prestige motive was not altogether lacking from these thefts, since wealth, either in money or in sheep, was an important element in the prestige standing of a family.

Before 1937 it seems possible to distinguish, in very broad outline, three areas and modes of hostility. Towards unrelated families, within a radius of some five miles from a family's own sheep, hostility was expressed in attitude rather than act. There existed constant distrust and suspicion, but an avoidance of provocation. In the second area, stretching beyond the first to a distance of ten miles and often somewhat farther, hostility found expression in the small-scale theft of sheep; the frequency of these acts, however, was limited by considerations of time and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori
Greece EH1

The Sarakatsanos does not deny the obligation to his merchant. Two heads of family went so far as to say that they would feel ashamed to leave, without just cause, a merchant who had supported them not only with credits but also, sometimes, with his political influence. But their feelings of obligation are ambivalent. In other contexts hostility is expressed. It is alleged that the merchant shamelessly exploits the shepherd and that all his actions are moved by entirely selfish motives. 'He, too, has a burn on his bottom' (ἔχει καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ καυκαλήμό του), that is, he, too, has his own troubles and interests.

Through the cheese merchant the Sarakatsanos is able to dispose of the most valuable part of the produce of his flock and to obtain the money he needs to pay for the pasturage of his animals and the needs of his family which are related to prestige as well as to bare subsistence. The system of credits provides the shepherd with the means to survive years when natural or political difficulties would otherwise force him to sell part of the flock to meet his commitments. It has also made it possible for the shepherds in recent years to raise slightly their material standard of living.

The growth of debts has brought a certain stability and particularism to relations between merchants and shepherds. Debt provides a basis for a permanent balance of expectations between the two parties despite the asymmetrical character of the relationship. The merchant is assured of the supply of milk which is essential for his prosperity, the shepherd is relatively assured of credit and political support when his grazing rights are threatened. The powerful merchant's ability to support a wide system of credit brings him prestige and the right to move amongst the provincial *élite*; the credit which he gives to the shepherd provides the necessary material basis of the latter's social prestige in his own community. Debts maintain these relationships. They produce in creditors some sense of obligation coupled with a determination not to allow the relationship to become an affective and diffuse bond of patronage, in debtors a mixed attitude of gratefulness for the support and protection they receive and enmity because they cannot escape.

6. CONCLUSION

It is evident that the form and function of patronage connexions are immediately related to the moral solidarity and isolation of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

554 and fearful that he may leave his dependants without a pro-
577 tector. But although the predicament of a man in this position is
596 appreciated by other Sarakatsani, it scarcely mitigates the loss of prestige. If a man has no adult son to protect his daughter's virtue, the fault is his. For weakness is despised. In itself it tends to diminish the prestige of a family even before it has
[156] led to dishonour. And men who are isolated without brothers or sons are noticeably less proud, less confident, and in some cases are, by Sarakatsan standards, pathetically diffident and nervous—overt personality traits which I have not observed in men born into large sibling groups with a number of brothers.

59 (B) WEALTH

554 Τὰ βιό is the property owned by a family, particularly its
556 flocks of sheep and goats, the mules and horses. Although money invested in other objects of prestige such as village houses is important, animals in a pastoral community are the significant form of wealth and a critical element in social reputation.

Today there are few families that own more than five hundred
[235] sheep and goats. A household with more than 150 animals holds a respectable position in the community, one with 80 to 120 animals is on the brink of poverty, while a group with less than 40 animals is despicably poor. Yet the question of wealth is not quite so simple as this arithmetical scale might suggest. The Myriounis extended family of five brothers have 476 animals. Only the flocks of two other families in the Neochori local group exceed theirs in size. So long as they remain a single family with this large flock and five adult men to serve and protect it, the family is clearly, in this respect, a group of high prestige among the Neochori shepherds and indeed in the total community. But when the family is forced to divide into a group of autonomous families, each brother will possess only 80–90 sheep and goats; it may, therefore, seem that at a single stroke they will fall from one end of the wealth-prestige scale to the other. In fact, however, so long as the families of a group of brothers hold together in a co-operative association, folding their sheep together in a single flock (although with different ear-signs), they continue to derive some prestige from the aggregate number of their animals. Still it will now be said, for instance, that Theodoros has only 80 sheep and goats of his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

own, but four children to provide for. As soon as people begin to calculate in this manner, the inadequacy of his personal wealth emerges, and to some extent his prestige falls. Men with no brothers who are forced to join the 'company' of a cousin or an affine gain some prestige and cover from the size of the co-operating group of which they form a part, but the size of their own flock is always very precisely appreciated by outsiders. The worst situation is that of the family head with only a few animals who is forced to become a wage shepherd to an unrelated man, since in this case poverty associated with dependence on a stranger destroys prestige.

Taken together, numbers and wealth are the necessary material foundation for high family prestige. They imply the independence of the family within the community, both economically in the sense that the group is viable (and possibly free of debt), and technically in that it has enough manpower to manage its flocks unaided. It suggests that the family will possess powerful patrons outside the community and that in the competition for winter pastures it will be in a better position to rent grazing land. A village generally prefers to let an area of reasonable size, and to negotiate with a prosperous group able to provide a steady and profitable flow of bribes and presents.

Also, it is the family of wealth and numbers, with powerful patrons and sufficient winter grazing, that draws to itself a number of less fortunate kinsmen. The dependence and support of these men make the protecting family the nucleus of a co-operative association, extending yet further its strength, influence, and prestige. It attracts many passing visits from other kinsmen. Men do not often visit kinsmen of low prestige, since such association only draws attention to a relationship which is best forgotten: on the other hand, they take every opportunity to pay a call on a kinsman of position and repute, to cultivate a relationship that is a source of possible support in future misfortune and, of itself, brings a measure of vicarious prestige.

Men like Pistiolis, who are at the lowest level of the community hierarchy of prestige, seldom receive a visitor from one year's end to another. Indeed, the number of visitors that a family receives is generally a reliable index of its reputation. It is

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had guests (μουσαφίρηδες); their quality, relationship, and the possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism, encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality (φιλοξενία), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of competition.

(c) LINEAGE[1]

Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relationships which a man inherits from both his father and mother; and the importance of this for prestige has already been discussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least, reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed, a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation, but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral. In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

[1] Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

/154 cont./

596 461 474 according to certain rules with which we shall discuss shortly. Each task is assigned to a defined group. It is carried out jointly within the appointed group. In the end, all profit from the fruit of the labor thus divided. The separate efforts merge so that what has been produced separately is enjoyed in common. Thus the extended family seen from the outside gives the impression of a beehive in which everybody works for everybody under the general direction of one head.

596 434 474 There is therefore nothing astonishing in the fact that the dispostion of the income is made according to collective criteria and not individual ones. The income belongs to the group. This rule, constituting the fourth and final /155/ organizational principle of Sarakatsani economy means that the income must benefit all. Nevertheless, this requires explanation, again on the basis of facts.

596 434 474 454 556 If, after the productive season, chiefly winter, profits have been realized, they are not divided up but invested in livestock. The results are the following: on the "ownership" level the members of the family and co-owners of the family fortune see their wealth increase. On the level of "daily life" nothing changes. The dress of the men or the women, or the harness of the horses may, of course, become more beautiful. But the daily round remains the same. Genuine enrichment is felt on the level of "social prestige." The stani, or simple unit of herding will become a Tséligato, or larger, more important unit, which will attract the lower class of herders who have been less successful. And 591 the family will find that other families seek alliance with them and compete for their young members of marriageable age.

596 474 556 591 There is no doubt that this increase of prestige will have repercussions on the herding enterprise. The social relations of a powerful family are less encumbered by hindrances and hostilities than /those of/ a weak family that is vulnerable and therefore more likely to be stopped by them. Everybody will cooperate with the former in a spirit of deference and consideration, anticipating the profits that may be

596 /155 cont./
474
556 derived from a good relationship with it. Business will thus become
591 easier and more profitable.

596 These benefits and advantages would never be realized if one
474 sought to enrich oneself individually and improve one's mode of life.
434 By establishing large flocks--which is only possible for a group, for
233 reasons that we shall see--a person certainly increases his patrimony. However, by acting in this way he aims chiefly to assert himself socially, to create situations whereby the group will benefit by means of a certain disposition of the income.

596 Yet there is more. Each family has the right to a certain portion
474 of the milk products and the wool, in terms of its own needs and indepen-
434 dently of the share that goes toward the family wealth. Now this type of income "in kind" is also controlled by the group. In order to
[126] examine this fact more specifically we shall reproduce a little story which we recorded on the spot:

596 /156/ An old Sarakatsani woman threw to the dogs the food that
474 the men had not eaten. This woman died. One night, after her burial,
689 her daughter-in-law heard noises coming from the dog shelter. She ran
775 there and saw her mother-in-law eating with them. She immediately
434 alerted her husband, the son of the deceased. But he, knowing that his wife was not on good terms with her mother-in-law, believed that it was a question of malice and paid no attention. But the appearance of the dead woman continued and finally the son was convinced that his mother had really become a ghost. In their dilemma, the couple called
[189] a priest who conducted a service on the grave. Thereupon gifts were
[431] handed out "in the name of the mother," and the dead woman, finally at rest, never reappeared.

596 In order to understand the profound significance of this anecdote
474 we must interpret the gravity of the punishment and the mode of
689 redemption for the sin committed. If the old woman was punished so
434 severely it was because she misused food--common property acquired by